*Special 6-Page Issue*

**Full Text Humphrey Proposals on Cessation of Nuclear Testing and Inspection, Pages 2, 3 & 4**

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 7 FEBRUARY 17, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

# If Only *They* Didn't Believe in Force and Violence

In the London *New Statesman* on February 8, Mr. Dulles replied on behalf of Mr. Eisenhower to the peace appeal Bertrand Russell had addressed to the President and to Krushchev. Mr. Dulles said in effect that it was difficult to negotiate with the Communists or to live in peace with them because they believe in force and violence. By coincidence, that same day, our French allies used American bombers to raid a Tunisian village, striking a schoolhouse and killing many civilians, including women and children. But when Mr. Dulles met the press three days later, he managed to parry all questions about this use of force and violence. Not by a single word did he condemn the French, or express sympathy for their victims.

### Christian Conscience Suddenly Blacked Out

This may seem remarkably self-restrained for one whose Christian conscience is normally kept in a prominent position. But Mr. Dulles was operating, of course, in a delicate area of foreign policy. To condemn the French might be to weaken NATO, and to weaken NATO would be to diminish the force and violence we can muster in case of need against the Communist world. To treat the aggressor and the victim with impartial equanimity is to tip the scales in favor of the former. But, then, in a showdown, the French are more important than the Arabs; the French are still a major military power. Mr. Dulles met the Tunisian crisis with the same deftness he showed a few years ago when our allies, the Turks, staged a pogrom against the Greeks living among them. He issued a statement which managed somehow to put the attackers and the victims on the same high juridical plane. Militarily, the Turks are more important than the Greeks. The scales of our policies are adjusted to the weight of armies, i.e. the ability to impose force and violence.

If it were not for a slip at press conference, it might have been thought that, living in a sinful world, Mr. Dulles was merely acquiescing in its bad *international* habits. But when Mr. Dulles was asked to "define a little more specifically for us" what were the U. S. objectives "in the Tunisian crisis," he launched instead into an exposition of American policy in the *Indonesian* crisis. This showed him as ready to gloss over force and violence in internal affairs. Rebel forces in Indonesia are threatening to overthrow the established government. Mr. Dulles indicated that we favor the rebels because we regard the government as Communist orientated. Mr. Dulles expressed sympathy for the rebel forces because, as he said, they are Moslem and don't like "that type of government," which maintains itself everywhere "by coercive methods." This sympathy for the Moslems of Indonesia may read strangely to the Moslems of Algeria who also feel themselves the victims of a government maintaining itself "by coercive methods." But, then, the French is not "that type of government" but the type we favor. If Mr. Dulles were not himself involved, he would be apt to say all this showed a deplorable tendency to act on the morally repugnant principle that the end justifies the means. Adherence to this principle is often cited by Mr. Dulles as another reason we cannot live at peace with *Them*.

### C'est la Guerre et la Politique

It would be nice if this little comedy, for which the innocent pay in blood and tears, could be ended by finding us a new Secretary of State. But Mr. Dulles, though more unctuous and harder to take than most, represents a universal tendency. Soviet sympathizers were as ready to excuse the use of tanks and planes against the people of Hungary on the ground of power politics; they said the Soviet Union could not afford to let the West take over Hungary and move its bases closer to Russian soil. It was too bad that women and children were hurt but, as Gaillard said in Paris of the Tunisian massacre, *c'est la guerre.*

These unfortunate habits are not confined to the big and imperialist Powers. Gandhi's heirs in India are as ready to kill innocent bystanders in war over Kashmir. The peace-loving neutralist Arabs are only waiting for a chance to loot in the ruins of Israel, and little Israel—as it showed in the Suez affair—was ready to risk engulfing the whole world in war in order to carry out what it considered a preventive attack on Egypt. Our Judaic conscience is dulled in this Tunisian affair by dependence on France for arms and by the guilty memory of what happened not so long ago to the Arabs of Kibya. The truth is that belief in force and violence seems to be the one creed all mankind holds in common, fraternally linking even a Dulles and a Krushchev. Anthropologists do indeed tell us that not all tribes are warlike, but the other kind are hard to locate, except in reservations.

### The Right to Kill

Everywhere men assume that they have a right to kill other men in defense of what they consider to be their vital interests. Since one man's vital interest is often another man's hurt, the carnage is difficult to equate with any morality. This universal complacency about killing, rather than communism, capitalism, colonialism or what have you, is the heart of the peace problem. Ultimate weapons in the hands of a species so badly conditioned make it urgent.



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Text of the Humphrey Proposal to Cease Nuclear Testing

**The Humphrey speech on disarmament and foreign policy with the remarks interjected by other Senators covers 25 pages of the Congressional Record for February 4 and there was no way for us to reprint them all. But we thought our readers would like to see in full text the most important part of the speech, the discussion of nuclear testing and inspection, so we reprint it here along with boxes which give selections from remarks by other Senators. Rather skimpy press coverage gave no conception of the talk that day on the Senate floor. It showed a considerable number of Senators full aware of the grave issues with which the thermonuclear arms race confronts mankind, and may thus encourage the isolated handful in the peace movement, who have felt like voices in the wilderness. We believe the Humphrey speech and that day's debate deserve wide consideration and if there is sufficient demand from readers and organizations we will provide a 6 page special reprint made up of the first two pages of last week's issue on the Humphrey speech and these three pages at 5 cents a copy in small orders and 3 cents for orders of 1,000 or more (plus postage.)—IFS.**

Mr. HUMPHREY—As to nuclear weapons tests, I believe that public opinion in the United States and throughout the world would support the suspension of these tests provided an adequate inspection and detection system can be installed in all testing countries and close to all possible test sites.

It has never been clear to me, all of the explanations and arguments of the administration notwithstanding, why the United States insists a test suspension with inspection safeguards should not be proposed as a separate measure.

President Eisenhower, in his cablegram to Prime Minister Nehru, gave the impression that weapons tests were not important as a factor in halting the arms race. He said:

"I do not believe that we can accept a proposal to stop nuclear experiments as an isolated step, unaccompanied by any assurances that other measures—which would go to the heart of the problem—would follow."

## Supposed to Be A First Step

In the first place, the term "heart of the problem" is a new way of stating the objectives of our disarmament policy. I thought it was to be a first step—a start toward world disarmament—that we were pursuing. I would like to know whether the President's cablegram represents a departure in the description of our proposals.

I agree with the President that a cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes constitutes the heart of the nuclear weapons problem. But the testing of weapons is not insignificant. A suspension of tests would retard, and I hope prevent, the spread of the production of these lethal weapons to other countries. According to Admiral Strauss in a letter to the Disarmament Subcommittee last June "there is no substitute for tests to determine the reliability of a weapon, conventional or atomic." What this means to me is that a test ban would freeze nuclear weapons development where it is now in the United States, the USSR, Great Britain and possibly France. According to the former Secretary of Defense, this would not preclude testing of missiles. If it did, a new problem would be presented.

Freezing nuclear weapons development at present levels should involve no threat to our security, since we have been assured that we are ahead of the USSR in this aspect of weapons technology.

Assuming, therefore, we are equal or ahead of the USSR on nuclear weapons development then I think we should press for an agreement on an inspection system to verify the suspension of these tests. I repeat, to gain admission to the USSR for inspection by an international agency, would be a political and technological breakthrough second to none.

For some peculiar reason this does not seem to sink in. For an international agency to gain access to the Soviet Union for purposes of inspection of the cessation of nuclear weapon testing would be a spectacular political development, and one we ought to search for relentlessly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I refer to the Senator's speech at page 27 of his text where he refers to nuclear weapons development, and states that we are well ahead of the USSR in this aspect of weapons technology.

That statement raises a question in my mind. It is this: Are we going to take the position that we are willing to agree to freeze or to control only in those cases where we are ahead?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I was merely trying to point out that if the argument was being advanced that we ought not to agree to a weapons test ban because it might jeopardize our security, that this is not an argument at all. We have security so far as numbers of nuclear weapons can give it to us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted the Senator to clarify that point, because I do not believe the impression should be left that the only times we might enter into an agreement would be when we were well ahead, which would mean automatically that the Russians would not agree because they were behind us.

### At Least An Equal Effort for Peace

**Mr. JOHNSON of Texas . . . what the Senator from Minnesota likewise has disclosed is that our plans for peace must progress jointly and be as firm as our plans for defense. In other words this must be a joint effort. We must not spend all of our billions of dollars and make all of our plans to fight a war which may never be fought. But in preparing our nation and in purchasing the implements, the missiles, the planes, and the submarines which may be necessary to prevent a war we should also have some positive, affirmative plan for peace, to go alongside our preparedness efforts.**

*—During the Humphrey speech, U.S. Senate, Feb. 4.*

### If Atomic War Comes, There May Not Ever Be A Second or A Third Day

**Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Minnesota were a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and if he had a chance to see the fantastic character of the weapons we contemplate for the future, and if he had an opportunity to measure their destructive power and also the limited space required to smuggle them into an area and to destroy a great civilization, then I am sure he, too, would be praying that we may have the sense to use them wisely or, as his very fine address suggests, to control their use and eventually to bring about a disarmament in the case of these weapons, which promise nothing but destruction to both sides. . . . It was my good fortune to listen to a great scientist discussing what a great nuclear war would be like. He was shocked that some people were talking about what would happen the second or third month. He said, 'I am not sure there will be a second or third day'."**

*—During the Humphrey speech, U.S. Senate, Feb. 4.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Criticizes U.S. Unwillingness to Explore Soviet Inspection Offer

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I tried to make that position clear in my previous remarks. I wish to make that position clear again. I reiterate that we must be willing to negotiate on these weapons items even in some instances where we may not have conclusive or decisive advantages, because we would be negotiating over the total picture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for his preparation of the information which he is now giving to the Senate and the country, and for his statesmanlike and extremely thorough statement of the subject. The Senator from Minnesota, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, is certainly the best qualified man in the Senate to speak on the subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have followed the Senator's discussion carefully. I say to him most respectfully that he has just reached a point which arouses a little apprehension in my mind, although not from the standpoint of the matter the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has brought out.

## Apprehension About Tests

Is it not true that some of the apprehension incident to the question of banning nuclear tests has had to do with our possibly not being able, under any known inspection procedure, to find out whether the Soviet Union was living up to its agreement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say to the Senator from Missouri—as I am sure he knows already from our many hours of listening to testimony on this subject matter and our studying it—that it is not true that we can have automatic knowledge of an A-bomb test merely from its explosion. That is not true any longer, although it may have been true at one time.

The fact is that some of the smaller weapons can be tested and not detected without an elaborate system of inspection. It is true that there are ways of testing such weapons under water and down in the bowels of the earth, so to speak, which would make the detection of their firing rather difficult.

However, I do not believe it is true that if we are permitted an inspection system in the country where the test takes place, that it would not be possible to determine that the test had taken place. What I am trying to say is not that we should agree to the suspension of tests, per se, but that we should have immediately challenged the Soviet Union when they said they were willing to agree to a suspension of tests and to inspections.

We should have at that moment said to the Soviet Union: "All right, what kind of inspection do you mean? Let us pursue this subject. Let us find out what you mean. How far do you intend to go?" If this is going to be a Korea-type inspection, we want none of it. That Korea type inspection was a politically conceived business that does little or no honor to the concept effective disarmament.

But last summer we ought to have pursued this subject. For the first time, we had a chance to pursue what the Soviets mean by inspection.

The junior Senator from Minnesota believes that if we could have been able to obtain an inspection system which provided for international inspectors and international inspection parties, it would have been very important in terms of weapons and in terms of disarmament, and terrifically important in terms of the political impact. That would have been the first time that this great monolithic society of the Soviet Union, under police control, would have been opened to the point where others could see what was going on. That is my view. I know the Senator and I have discussed this question at some length, and we may have a little difference of opinion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am not so sure. I am not at all sure that I disagree in any way with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. As I understand what my colleague has just said, the premise of all this discussion is an inspection system which it was decided would work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Prior to any agreement on our part to enter into any bilateral agreement to suspend tests.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, I thoroughly agree, and I am delighted that the Senator from Missouri has again brought this out for our comment. What I am stressing is the fact that we have permitted the Soviet Union to appear throughout the world as if they were the great ban-the-bomb-tests people; the stop-the-tests advocate; the stop-the-radioactive-fallout crusaders.

We have appeared before the world as if we favored radioactive fallout; as if we positively enjoyed bomb testing.

### The Russians Have Legitimate Fears of Us, Too

**Mr. JAVITS. I believe that the Senator from Minnesota has touched upon several points of the utmost importance. . . . First, he is pointing out to the American people that the Russians, in entertaining the fears which they entertain, are only acting naturally. If we were in their place, we would consider such fears legitimate, just as we consider our concern legitimate, from our standpoint. Therefore it is superficial to write off the Russians as fanatics, or as people who are needlessly concerned over what foreigners might do to them. Their fears are the understandable, natural fears of any great power, and must be separated from the philosophy which we should try to understand, and which we are doing our utmost to cope with.**

*—During the Humphrey speech, U.S. Senate, Feb. 4.*

### Millions Who Want to Learn How to Live, Not How to Be Cremated

**Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps we could win the missile race and perhaps we could overtake Russia in both the IRBM and the ICBM fields; yet we could still lose such a war, because I have the feeling that the one billion people who live in southeast Asia, Indonesia, Japan, Iraq, Iran, the Middle East and North Africa are far more interested in finding out how hundreds of millions of people can live, instead of how many hundreds of millions of people can be cremated in the first 10 hours of an intercontinental nuclear war.**

**So I believe that the other side of the shield of atomic power and nuclear energy is going to be what my friends, the former chairman and the former vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] and others have tried to make it be. What they have attempted to do has been to beat the atom into a plough-share. Their imaginative approach has been toward using the byproducts of atomic energy to cure diseases, to permit the raising of better crops, to improve transportation, and above all to make pure water for irrigation purposes out of sea water—all that to be done by the use of atomic reactors. This approach, if we but devote our minds and our money—money measured almost in terms of pennies, as compared to the thousand dollar bills we are spending for instruments of death—will win the hearts and minds of peoples around the world.**

*—During the Humphrey speech, U.S. Senate, Feb. 4.*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Suggests Joint Teams of Russian and U.S. Scientists on Arms Problem

That, of course, is not the view of the American people. It is not the spirit of our country.

Why have we got ourselves into this position? Every time the Soviet Union makes a proposal—and this is ironic; it is something like the case of Pavlov's dog, except that Pavlov was a Russian—we automatically say "No."

We said, "No," when the Soviet Union had been urging for years that the bomb tests be stopped. But one day in London the chief negotiator of the Soviet Union said, "We would like to discuss stopping the tests, with inspection, to see whether or not the agreement is kept up or maintained." We said, "No." We did not even explore what they meant by "inspection." For the first time we had that chance. We insisted after they had agreed to inspection, that they go one stop further.

## Two Separate Inspection Problems

I say we can separate this package. We can have a suspension of tests with inspection, if we can get that agreement, and then have inspection over the stopping of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. In other words, we can break up the whole fissionable material problem into separate packages with inspection.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With respect to the position in which we have now been placed before the world by the able diplomatic representations of the Soviet Union, as presented by the Senator in this last part of the colloquy I have had the privilege of entering into with him, I am in complete agreement with the Senator. I am also in agreement with him that we should go through with any suspension of testing or production, provided we are certain that any agreed-upon inspection system is sound to the point where there can be no cheating.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly accept that statement as the position I hold.

This proposal, according to the administration, is considered to be the most important of all the points in the package. We should remove it from the package and offer to negotiate on it separately.

The Soviet Union has never flatly rejected this proposal, although the Soviets have never appeared enthusiastic about it. I want the RECORD to be clear, however, that they have never said No to this proposal.

Negotiations for a cutoff would center on the inspection system needed to verify the production ban. The Soviet Union undoubtedly is fearful of such an inspection system. Our negotiators must press harder to persuade Mr. Krushchev and his subordinates that an inspection system to verify a cutoff of production of fissionable material for weapons purposes is not only essential but urgent if the world ever expects to put a ceiling on the amount of available nuclear ammunition.

Devising an adequate and acceptable inspection system must be determined by the experts and the negotiators.

### Another Menace Few Talk About

**Mr. MANSFIELD. I know there has been a great deal of emphasis on nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and devices. I think we ought to remember also, in addition to that, there is such a thing as bacteriological warfare, which can be just as devastating, just as killing, just as successful in eradicating from the face of the earth not only human life as we know it, but produce and the fruits of the soil as well.**

*—During the Humphrey speech, U.S. Senate, Feb. 4.*

The administration apparently thinks it would not be too difficult. Admiral Strauss has indicated in regard to inspection for a cutoff that while an adequate system of control and inspection cannot be simple, nevertheless it should be feasible to install such a system. The French weapons control expert, Jules Moch, has asserted that assuming all nuclear facilities are declared or are known, "on the whole, less staff is required in a large country to control the cutoff of manufacture for military purposes than to verify that there are no secret explosions." Mr. Moch further asserts that as of this time there are less than 100 nuclear facilities in the world that would need to be inspected.

With respect to the requirements for both the inspection system for a cutoff of production and for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests, I propose that the executive branch appoint two teams of prominent and highly qualified nuclear scientists and weapons experts. One should be charged with making a complete and thorough study of the requirements of inspection for a test ban; the other group for inspection for a cutoff of production. These two groups should offer to meet with comparable scientists and nuclear experts from the Soviet Union in order to devise inspection systems acceptable to both countries. If the U. S. S. R. refuses both of these proposals then we should try such a proposal on the nongovernmental level. The United States National Academy of Sciences could appoint two teams of weapons experts. These teams might then negotiate with the Soviet Academy of Sciences to determine whether they could agree on the necessary requirements of an inspection system to verify a test ban on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

It is important for our Government to know what we mean by "inspection," if we are to continue to talk about it. It means that our Government must proceed to develop inspection proposals, to have them in being, and to know what to do in case an agreement is reached. I am sure there has been much talk about disarmament and agreements, but there has been little follow-through in terms of the meticulous detail which will be required for an effective inspection and control system.

## Morse Suggests Neutral Nations Be Asked to Mediate Russo-American Arms Controversy

**Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think we ought to pursue the possibility of reaching some kind of agreement between the Western powers and the Communist powers by having an entirely independent third party group—perhaps someone from Norway, someone from Sweden, and someone from India, simply to name three possibilities—and I am not limiting them to these possibilities—which would give consideration to the exchanges which have taken place between the Western powers and the Communist powers? That group then could make recommendations of procedures which they thought might break the logjam which apparently has developed between Russia and the United States and Great Britain. Does the Senator think that proposal has merit?**

**Mr. HUMPHREY. I do. . . .**

**Mr. MORSE. . . . It seems to me that much of the Dulles approach, and certainly all of the Krushchev approach, is based upon a static conception of national sovereignty. I urge my friend from Minnesota to ponder the problem of national sovereignty from this angle: That any issue which in fact, threatens the peace of the world no longer is an issue that any nation has a right to reserve unto itself for judgment. . . . We are entering an era in the history of mankind when we shall have to modify the conception of national sovereignty if nations are to survive.**

*—During the Humphrey speech, U.S. Senate, Feb. 4.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Bigger Issues Behind Those FCC Expense Accounts; We Ought to Negotiate In Korea If Possible**

# Too Much Apathy on Civil Rights Though It May Shape America's Future

A joint council of liberal white and Negro organizations to initiate a broad program of public education on civil rights is badly needed. There is too much indifference among whites and too much apathy among Negroes. The issue behind the new civil rights bill introduced by Senator Douglas and a bi-partisan group in the Senate is not whether rights legislation shall be strengthened. The real issue lies in the determination of the South to nullify the law, and to dig in for a counter-offensive which takes on Fascist overtones. Southern racists are confident they can not only hold the South but eventually make the North see it their way. The extent of Southern nullification, the multitude of new laws to rob Negroes of protection, the philosophy of the supremacists and its threat, all need to be driven home. So far, even in liberal circles, the civil rights fight has been primarily a Negro battle. Too many "relaxed" with last year's victory. This is already being undermined by Administration indifference and Congressional hostility to the Civil Rights Commission, which still has no staff director or permanent staff.

MORE THAN EXPENSE ACCOUNTS are involved in the Bernard Schwartz case. That brave innocent got caught in the middle of Washington's dirtiest deal—the Republicans promised to put full steam behind the natural gas bill if the Democrats would go easy in investigating regulatory agencies which have grown extraordinarily slack if not downright corrupt under a "business man's Administration." The uproar may block a natural gas bill again this year. It is a pity there can't be a real investigation of FCC, especially the heart of the TV problem. Unused almost limitless UHF channels could open TV for everybody's use and break the monopoly held by NBC, CBS, and ABC with their inane commercials and overwhelming commercialism. Unfortunately most big newspapers now have radio and TV outlets of their own, are affiliated with the networks, seek FCC favors and want no such investigation. . . . KOREA: remembering how much Korea cost in American lives and treasure, there ought to be public pressure for exploration of joint Chinese Communist and North Korean offers of reunification with free elections if troops are withdrawn. That divided peninsula is an open wound which may flare up at any time. . . . WHO CARES BUT THE DEAD: Few papers even bothered to run the AP dispatch from Frankfurt Feb. 6 on the release of Hans-Bodo Gorgasz, sentenced to death 11 years ago for murdering more than 10,000 persons in Nazi gas ovens. . . .

### Maybe It's Unanimous

**"If the Russians can discredit Mr. Dulles . . . that would be another cold war victory."**

*—Sen. Bridges defending him, U.S. Senate, Feb. 6.*

**"It is a fact that he [Dulles] is unpopular among our allies. Why? The United States is a leader. It is up to the Secretary of State to point out the hard right way. It is not easy. It is not the way they want to follow. They are tired of carrying this burden."**

*—Sen. Morton, U.S. Senate, same day.*

**"There may be some who will disagree with me; but I have had occasion—especially in the last few months—to visit a great many foreign countries. The loudest chorus of allegations that John Foster Dulles is disliked by the nations abroad comes from Washington, D. C."**

*—Sen. Hickenlooper, a few minutes later.*

OUR JOURNALISTIC HAT is off to Ed Lahey of the *Chicago Daily News* for ingenuity in discovering and courage in exposing Sherman Adams as the "go-ahead-and-print-it-but-don't-say-I-told-you" source of that *New York Times* and *Herald Tribune* story Feb. 2 that Ike wanted Stassen to resign. Editors campaigning for freedom of information could begin reform at home by refusing to print off the record stab-in-the-back stories, make officials assume responsibility for what they want to say, and give readers a means of evaluating those veiled "authoritative sources" on which dispatches are so often based. . . . APOLOGIES to Senators Neuberger and Proxmire for an unintentional slight in last week's story on the Humphrey speech. Both made speeches supporting Humphrey but were unable to get the floor until next day, too late for last week's issue. . . . FALSE INFORMATION was given the press by Democratic National Committee Chairman Paul Butler after the Democratic Advisory Committee meeting when he said "no changes of substance" were made in Dean Acheson's original draft of its foreign policy statement, Adlai Stevenson, Governor Harriman and Paul Ziffren among other tore into and revised it as too inflexible and lacking in any emphasis on the need to search for peace. . . . MORE THAN 200 letters and telegrams, almost all favorable poured into Humphrey's office within three days of his peace speech. . . . PERSONAL NOTE: *Esquire* for March debunks Washington's newsletters but gives ours a friendly boost as "the heady champion of many American liberals . . . now in its sixth year."

### Bridges Defends Nuclear Testing As A Virtual Health Measure!

**"The plain fact is that continued testing of nuclear weapons is to the general benefit of mankind, not its harm. Our Eniwetok tests of 1956 demonstrated that the radioactive peril could be virtually eliminated . . . this year's tests will greatly advance the development of an anti-missile nuclear weapon. What a happy day for mankind if we found the means for neutralizing the holocaust incident to hydrogen attack. . . . Yet the Soviet Union has been able to influence large sections of our population toward the belief that testing in itself is immoral."**

*—Sen. Bridges defending Dulles, U.S. Senate, Feb. 6.*

**"The FAS Council urges international agreement to prohibit further testing of nuclear weapons . . . it would prevent the entry into the arms race of still more nations . . . it would allay the fears aroused by the potential hazards of radioactive fallout. The extent of these hazards has been, at least by implication, unduly exaggerated by some and unduly minimized by others. Still, that there are some lethal effects is denied by no one. Those who continue testing must therefore be prepared to publish good and sufficient cause or desist in the name of humanity."**

*—Council, Federation of American Scientists, Feb. 8.*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**1957 Annual Un-American Activities Report Gold Mine for Psychiatric Study**

# House Committee Sees U.S. Communist Party Now Mobilizing Millions

The annual report of the House Un-American Activities Committee for 1957 begins with Sputnik. It sees in the Soviet satellite "fresh evidence" that Soviet technological progress was "made possible to a large degree . . . by Soviet conspirators and their theft of some of our most vital military and scientific secrets." The Committee might have added that in the case of Sputnik, judging by delay in putting up one of our own, the Russians seem to have stolen the original as well as the carbon copy.

Wm. Z. Foster will find the report comforting. It says that notwithstanding "eruptions" in the party, the resignation of key officials and the closing of the *Daily Worker*, "the Communist operation today presents a menace more serious than ever before." The Committee, its faith in the Party strong, is sure that "As the formal party structure recedes from view, it is being replaced by a widespread underground apparatus, duplicating beneath the surface all the mechanism of Communist party activities. . . ."

## Never So Successful Before

The report was split up into seven sections, and released on seven consecutive days for maximum publicity. The second part began with a bang, "A nationwide campaign of political subversion, directed by the Communist Party and aided by numerous affiliate organizations, has spread throughout the United States during the past year as part of what may emerge as the most successful technique thus far devised by the Soviet apparatus in the United States. The Kremlin has succeeded in enlisting, at a conservative estimate, more than a million Americans into this campaign." We're glad the Committee was conservative.

The Committee claims to have identified "more than 200 organizations charged with carrying on the Communist program" but perhaps for security reasons names only three, the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and the latter's "main adjunct" the California Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedom. The main objective of this vast network is abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

### Only 16 Years To Go

**"A prediction that the international Communist conspiracy will achieve its goal of world domination in about 16 years, if its present rate of expansion continues unabated, was made by Dr. Frederick Charles Schwarz, executive director of the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade. . . . Dr. Schwarz, an Australian physician, surgeon and psychiatrist, has spent many years in study and research into the basic philosophy of communism. . . . 'Negotiation with the Soviet Union,' Dr. Schwarz warned, 'is impossible. To think we can do it is to indicate a failure to understand communism so completely that it approaches mental illness."**

*—Un-American Activities Com. Report for 1957.*

Though these organizations have trouble meeting their rent money, the Committee says they have "raised millions of dollars" and "they have been able to create a climate of opinion in which attacks upon our immigration and security systems are made to appear an enlightened course of action." Devilishly, these organizations pretend to "champion the traditional concepts of decency and fair play."

Repeal of the Walter-McCarran immigration act is another objective of the conspiracy. An expert witness, Archibald Roosevelt, is quoted as explaining that the purpose of this campaign is to protect "the Red strategists . . . filtered in through our weak immigration barriers throughout the years." Mr. Roosevelt said "the Soviet leaders have moved entire divisions of their political army into our country unnoticed by all except a few security minded citizens. These Red forces are a political army which is civilian in appearance and walk down the streets of America indistinguishable from the rest of the population." A walk down the street with Mr. Roosevelt must be a spine-tingling experience.

Another expert witness, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, is quoted as finding the success of Communism in (1) the fact that it "comes into a world that is sick with relativism, and offers an absolute" and (2) because "some people—not all, God forbid — have an exaggerated interest in social justice." Apparently people who believe in social justice should be watched.

***IFS Speaks at First Amendment Rally in Carnegie Recital Hall, N. Y., Friday, Feb. 28***

**I. F. Stone's Weekly,** 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

**Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:***

**Name** .....

**Street** .....

**City** .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

**Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:**

2/17/58

**(To) Name** .....

**Street** .....

**City** .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

**Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐**

*I. F. Stone's Weekly*

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in th U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED